REMARKS

This reply is responsive to the Office Action mailed on March 10, 2005. Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Reconsideration in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 18, Applicants have amended the claim to clarify that the limitations referred to by the Examiner are, in fact, part of the claimed invention. Withdrawal of the rejection respectfully requested.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, 12-17, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Menand et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,563,648, issued October 8, 1996) (Menand). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Menand discloses a method for controlling execution of an audio video interactive (AVI) program. Specifically, Menand discloses controlling the execution of the AVI program comprising the following steps. "First, loading the AVI program into a memory in response to the presence of the AVI program in the packet stream. Then beginning execution of the loaded AVI program. And then minimizing the executing AVI program

when a directory identifying a different AVI program is detected in the packet stream." (Menand, Abstract)

The Examiner's attention is directed to the fact that Menand fails to disclose "a registry package for storing objects that represent the resources", as recited in Applicants' indcpendent claims. Specifically, claims 1 and 20 recite:

1. A television set-top terminal, comprising:
a computer readable medium having computer program code means; and
means for executing said computer program code means to implement an Application Programming Interface (API) for accessing and managing multiple resources at the terminal, wherein:
the API provides a resource package for registering the available resources at the terminal, a management package for managing states of the resources, and a registry package for storing objects that represent the resources. (emphasis added)

20. A method for implementing a software architecture for a television set-top terminal, comprising the steps of:
providing a computer readable medium having computer program code means; and
executing said computer program code means to implement an Application Programming Interface (API) for accessing and managing multiple resources at the terminal; wherein:
the API provides a resource package for registering the available resources at the terminal, a management package for managing states of the resources, and a registry package for storing objects that represent the resources. (emphasis added)

The present invention discloses an application programming interface (API) for a television terminal that provides a uniform mechanism for gaining/controlling access to resources, managing multiple resources of the same type, and accessing the individual resource's management state and status. The API includes three packages: resource, management, and registry. In one embodiment, the API provides a resource package for registering the available resources at the terminal, a resource state management package

for managing states of the resources, and a registry package for storing objects that represent the resources.

In contrast, Menand fails to disclose an API that includes a resource package, a management package, and a registry package. In particular, Menand fails to disclose "a registry package for storing objects that represent the resources" as recited in claims 1 and 20. The Examiner argues that Menand's multitasking kernel reads on the registry package of claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree. The multitasking kernel of Menand "maintains process priorities, active task queues, signals, semaphores, preemptive task switching clock ticks, interrupts (hardware and software), and process stacks. In addition, the kernel provides hardware initialization and initiation of the first system task, which is a system loader." (Menand, col. 5, lines 40-47) Even if the kernel of Menand interacts with drivers as argued by the Examiner, Menand is still devoid of the teaching, disclosure, or suggestion that the multitasking kernel stores objects that represent resources.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 20 are patentable over Menand. Claims 3, 4, 7-9, 12-17 are patentable at least by virtue of depending from their respective base claim. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. Claims 2 and 11

Claims 2 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Menand. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Examiner concedes that Menand fails to disclose the use of the ITU-T X.731 state management standard. The Examiner also concedes that Menand fails to disclose advertising alarm statuses to an application. In order to cure the Examiner's perceived deficiency of Menand, Official Notice was taken by the Examiner.

Applicants traverse the Examiner's use of Official Notice with respect to claim 2. Applicants specifically traverse the Examiner's finding that the ITU-T X.731 standard "*makes use of* a number of different states". The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide a rejection citing the ITU-T X.731 reference.

Applicants traverse the Examiner's use of Official Notice with respect to claim 11. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide a reference that teaches that an API enables resources to advertise alarm statuses.

In addition, as argued above in Section II., Menand fails to teach, disclose, or suggest "a registry package for storing objects that represent the resources", as recited in claim 1. The Examiner's use of Official Notice fails to cure the deficiencies of Menand as noted in Section II. As such, Applicants submit that claims 2 and 11 are patentable at least by virtue of depending from claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

B. Claim 5

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Barker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,363,421, issued March 26, 2002) in view of Arda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,026,403) (Arda). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants note that the Examiner cites Barker et al. but fails to mention Barker in the body of the rejection. Applicants assume that the Examiner mistakenly cited Barker et al. instead of Menand and will argue based on that assumption.

Applicants submit that the cited patent number for Arda is incorrect. The Applicants assume that the correct number for Arda et al. is U.S. Patent No. 6,026,405, issued February 15, 2000, and will argue based on that assumption.

The Examiner concedes that Menand fails to disclose if the API is independent of an operating system and hardware of the terminal. In order to cure the Examiner's perceived deficiency of Menand, the Examiner cites Arda.

Arda discloses an apparatus and method of mapping a file name to a computer system in a network of computer systems. In a first embodiment, a list of names of the computer systems starting with a root name is created. The filename itself starts with a root name and consists of an aggregation of names. When the filename is obtained, each name is matched one at a time and in the order of appearance to the names in the list. In order for a match, the order of appearance of the names in the list of names and that of the names in the filename must be the same. The last name in the list of names to be matched with a name in the filename represents a computer system within which the file is contained. In a second embodiment, the list of names is in the form of a tree of names. Matching the names of the tree to the names in the filename includes traversing a branch of that tree to a leaf node, the leaf node being the last node in the tree. (Arda, Abstract)

As argued above in Section II., Menand fails to teach, disclose, or suggest "a registry package for storing objects that represent the resources", as recited in claim 1. Arda fails to cure the deficiencies of Menand as noted in Section II. As such, Applicants

submit that claim 5 is patentable at least by virtue of depending from claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

C. Claim 6

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Barker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,363,421, issued March 26, 2002) in view of Taylor et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,310,949, issued October 30, 2001) (Taylor). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants note that the Examiner cites Barker et al. but fails to mention Barker in the body of the rejection. Applicants assume that the Examiner mistakenly cited Barker et al. instead of Menand and will argue based on that assumption.

The Examiner concedes that Menand fails to disclose if the API groups resources of the same type and manages the grouped resources as a group. In order to cure the Examiner's perceived deficiency of Menand, the Examiner cites Taylor.

Taylor discloses an intelligent communications network. In one embodiment, a service node is used in an intelligent communications network for providing services for customers. (Taylor, Abstract)

As argued above in Section II., Menand fails to teach, disclose, or suggest "a registry package for storing objects that represent the resources", as recited in claim 1. Taylor fails to cure the deficiencies of Menand as noted in Section II. As such, Applicants submit that claim 6 is patentable at least by virtue of depending from claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

D. Claim 10

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Barker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,363,421, issued March 26, 2002) in view of Dasgupta (U.S. Patent No. 5,699,500, issued December 16, 1997). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants note that the Examiner cites Barker et al. but fails to mention Barker in the body of the rejection. Applicants assume that the Examiner mistakenly cited Barker et al. instead of Menand and will argue based on that assumption.

The Examiner concedes that Menand fails to disclose if the API enables administrative locking and unlocking of resources. In order to cure the Examiner's perceived deficiency of Menand, the Examiner cites Dasgupta.

Dasgupta discloses a datagram messaging service for a distributed lock manager implemented on a clustered computer system including a plurality of processing nodes interconnected through a network. The messaging service establishes and maintains a plurality of virtual circuits between the processing nodes, a single virtual circuit connecting each pair of processing nodes within the clustered computer system. A distributed lock manager driver is included within each processing node, the driver including a communication service providing for the generation of datagrams comprising lock manager instructions for transmission to other processing nodes within the clustered computer system via said virtual circuits and also providing for the receipt of datagrams generated and transmitted by the other processing nodes. (Dasgupta, Abstract)

As argued above in Section II., Menand fails to teach, disclose, or suggest "a registry package for storing objects that represent the resources", as recited in claim 1. Dasgupta fails to cure the deficiencies of Menand as noted in Section II. As such,

Applicants submit that claim 10 is patentable at least by virtue of depending from claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

E. Claims 18 and 19

Claims 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Barker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,363,421, issued March 26, 2002) in view of Alexander et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,177,931, issued January 23, 2001) (Alexander). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants note that the Examiner cites Barker et al. but fails to mention Barker in the body of the rejection. Applicants assume that the Examiner mistakenly cited Barker et al. instead of Menand and will argue based on that assumption.

The Examiner concedes that Menand fails to disclose the use of an electronic program guide, which connects to the Internet. In order to cure the Examiner's perceived deficiency of Menand, the Examiner cites Alexander.

Alexander discloses an electronic program guide that provides: Improved viewer interaction capabilities with the EPG; improved viewer control of video recording of future-scheduled programming; improved features to the EPG display and navigation; parental control of the EPG display; improved television program information access by the viewer; improved opportunities for the commercial advertiser to reach the viewer; improved product information access by the viewer; creation of a viewer's profile; utilization of viewer profile information to customize various aspects of the EPG; and utilization of viewer profile information to provide customized presentation of advertising to the viewer. (Alexander, Abstract)

As argued above in Section II., Menand fails to teach, disclose, or suggest "a registry package for storing objects that represent the resources", as recited in claim 1. Alexander fails to cure the deficiencies of Menand as noted in Section II. As such, Applicants submit that claim 10 is patentable at least by virtue of depending from claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Conclusion

Having fully responded to the Office action, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Should any issues arise that prevent early allowance of the above application, the examiner is invited contact the undersigned to resolve such issues.

To the extent an extension of time is needed for consideration of this response, Applicant hereby request such extension and, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account number 502117 for any fees associated therewith.

Date: 6/9/05

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Thomas Bethea, Jr.
Reg. No.: 53,987

Motorola Connected Home Solutions
101 Tournament Drive
Horsham, PA 19044
(215) 323-1797